UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/936,690	09/17/2001	Andreas Ebert	1454.1098	9237

			EXAMINER
21171	7590	05/19/2004	ARSHAD, UMAR

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/936,690	EBERT, ANDREAS
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Umar Arshad	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 September 2001</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>3-36</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>15-36</u> is/are rejected.
7)☒ Claim(s) <u>3-14</u> is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: it is dependent on cancelled claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 4 – 14 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 20 recites the limitations "the data server" and "the mobile computer" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 16 – 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Kanevsky, U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947.

As per claim 16, Kanevsky teaches a method for mapping control characters

included as elements of a hypertext markup language, comprising:

reading first data (see Kanevsky, column 7, lines 10 – 13 and lines 58 – 66; the

examiner interprets a received webpage as a first data);

determining whether predetermined control characters are included in the first

data (see Kanevsky, column 8, lines 29 – 34);

dynamically determining a parameter based on resources of at least one of a

computer performing the mapping and a communication connection between a mobile

computer and a data server (see Kanevsky, column 6, lines 21 – 27); and

mapping the first data onto second data according to the parameter, based on the predetermined control characters (see Kanevsky, column 7, lines 25 – 29).

As per claim 15, it is of similar scope to claim 16 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 16 (see rejection above).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, Kanevsky teaches the method of claim 16 (see rejection above). Kanevsky further teaches the method as claimed in claim 16, wherein the second data represent the empty set (see Kanevsky, column 15, lines 12 – 17; the examiner interprets deleting text as mapping it to the empty set).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 16, Kanevsky teaches the method of claim 16 (see rejection above). Kanevsky further teaches the method as claimed in claim 16, wherein the parameter characterizes underlying hardware (see Kanevsky, column 6, lines 21 – 27).

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 16, Kanevsky teaches the method of claim 16 (see rejection above). Kanevsky further teaches the method as claimed in claim 16, wherein the control characters are hypertext markup language tags (see Kanevsky, column 9, lines 46 – 57).

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 16, Kanevsky teaches the method

of claim 16 (see rejection above). Kanevsky further teaches the method as claimed

claim 16, wherein the data server and a mobile computer are connected via a network

(see Kanevsky, column 4, line 61 – column 5, line 3).

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 20, Kanevsky teaches the method

of claim 20 (see rejection above). Kanevsky further teaches the method as claimed in

claim 20, wherein the network is the Internet (see Kanevsky, column 4, lines 61 – 64).

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 20, Kanevsky teaches the method

of claim 20 (see rejection above). Kanevsky further teaches the method as claimed in

claim 16, wherein said mapping is performed for a subset of all possible control

characters (see Kanevsky, column 9, lines 35 – 41).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 16, Kanevsky teaches the method

of claim 16 (see rejection above). Kanevsky further teaches the method as claimed in

claim 16, wherein said mapping includes at least one of:

identically mapping each control character belonging to a predetermined set of

known control characters;

transparently mapping unknown control characters; mapping an unknown control

character into a known control character;

erasing an unknown control character; and

transparently displaying an alternative text entry for an unknown control

character (see Kanevsky, column 15, lines 12 – 17).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 16, Kanevsky teaches the method of claim 16 (see rejection above). Kanevsky further teaches the method as claimed in claim 16, further comprising determining a degree of scaling for detailing of said mapping, based on the parameter (see Kanevsky, column 7, lines 25 – 29).

As per claims 25 – 33, they are of similar scope to claims 16 – 24, respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale.

As per claims 34 and 35, they are of similar scope to claim 16 and are rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 35, Kanevsky teaches the method of claim 35 (see rejection above). Kanevsky further teaches system according to claim 35, wherein said user device is a mobile computer (see Kanevsky, column 5, lines 5 – 9) and the second data contains no characters for at least one of the predefined control characters in the first data (see Kanevsky, column 15, lines 12 – 17; the examiner interprets deleting text during interpretation as containing no characters for a certain text to map to).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umar Arshad whose telephone number is (703) 305-0329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

UA

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100